REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,598,023 to Drummond et al. (hereinafter "**Drummond et al.**") and has rejected claims 7-9 under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over **Drummond et al**.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Drummond et al. discloses an automated banking machine (12) is operative to conduct transactions in response to HTML documents and TCP/IP messages exchanged with a local computer system (14) through an intranet (16), as well as in response to messages exchanged with foreign servers (20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 96) in a wide area network (18). The banking machine includes a computer (34) having an HTML document handling portion (76, 80, 82). The HTML document handling portion is operative to communicate through a proxy server (88), with a home HTTP server (90) in the intranet or the foreign servers in the wide area network, which may be the Internet. The computer further includes a device application portion (84) which interfaces with the HTML document handling portion and dispatches messages to operate devices (36) in the automated banking machine. The devices include a sheet dispenser mechanism (42) which dispenses currency as well as other transaction devices. The device application portion communicates with a device interfacing software portion (64) in the banking machine through a device server (92) in the intranet. The device server maintains local control over the devices in the banking machine including the sheet dispenser. The banking machine operates to read indicia on the user's card corresponding to

a system address. The computer is operative to connect the banking machine to the home or foreign server corresponding to the system address, which connected server operates the banking machine until the completion of transactions by the user.

There is no disclosure in **Drummond et al.** of descriptions for a separate normal processing state table and a WEB transaction-use processing state table, as claimed in the present invention, where the WEB transaction process is carried out based upon the WEB transaction processing unit. Although the Examiner urges that JAVA applets disclosed in **Drummond et al.** constitute such a WEB transaction-use processing state table, there is no disclosure in **Drummond et al.** that this is so or that there is a distinction between state tables during normal processing or WEB processing on the Internet, as in the claimed invention.

The present invention includes a WEB transaction-use processing state table in addition to a normal processing state table in an automatic transaction device, which carries out a normal transaction process as described in the preamble of claim 1 and enables one to carry out a WEB transaction as well as a normal transaction. In the present invention the WEB transaction-use processing state table is used when access is made to the WEB and is a table which enhances the normal processing state table, and further which stipulates a WEB transaction carried out by the WWW by the same specifications as the normal processing state table. On the contrary, **Drummond et al.** neither teaches nor suggests using two processing state tables separately according to different situations.

23

These features are disclosed from page 13, line 20 to page 15, line 7 of the specification of the instant application.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to clarify these distinctions, and the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-10, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP

William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/xl/alw
Atty. Docket No. **010118**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930

23850
PATENT TRADEMARK

Enclosure: Substitute Abstract

Q:\FLOATERS\WLB\01\010118\Amendment re 1st OA of 6-22-04

25